

Handwritten mark



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,928	03/30/2001	Thomas N. Turba	RA 5390 (33012/320/101)	8178

27516 7590 11/18/2004

UNISYS CORPORATION
MS 4773
PO BOX 64942
ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MERILYN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Handwritten mark

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,928

Applicant(s)

TURBA, THOMAS N.

Examiner

Merilyn P Nguyen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Detailed Action</u> . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/16/2004 has been entered.
2. In response to the communication dated 09/16/2004, claims 1-20 are pending in this office action.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 of copending Application No. 09/822686. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the same limitations.

Regarding claims 1, 6, and 16 of the instant application, these claims recite all the elements of claims 1, 6, and 16 of the '686 application, except that it further includes the limitation of presenting a plurality of valid steps as choices or selections for addition to each of plurality of discreet and independent steps. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the limitation of presenting a plurality of valid steps as choices or selections for addition to each of plurality of discreet and independent steps as claimed in the instant application, since with or without this limitation, the scope of the invention would not be changed. Furthermore, it's well known in the art that for each step there is always sub steps in order to a complete function. The motivation would have been to expand the overall use of claimed invention at no significant cost.

The subject matter of claims 2, 3, 5, 7-10, and 18-20 of the '686 application are the same as claims 2, 3, 5, 7-10, and 18-20 of instant application.

Regarding claim 11 of the instant application, this claim recites all the elements of claim 11 of the '686 application, except that it further includes the iteration/repetition of steps in claim 11 of '686 application. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to repeat or iterate the steps of '686 application as claimed in the

instant application. The motivation would have been to expand the overall use of claimed invention at no significant cost.

The subject matter of claims 13, 14, and 15 of the '928 application are same as claims 13, 14, and 15 of the instant application.

5. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claim 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beall (US 6,169,992).

Regarding claim 16, Beall teaches an apparatus includes Client Firewall 5125 for permitting a user to access Internet 5124 (Fig. 5), so that data base management services is provided such as services for accessing a data base management system (Col. 3, line 20 to Col. 4, line 27) and modify data within a data base (Col. 43, lines 48-46, and col. 50, lines 9-16). Designing a service (query building) through specification of an ordered plurality of discreet and independent steps and presenting a plurality of valid potential steps for selection of each of said

ordered plurality of discreet and independent steps are addressed in the analysis following: Beall teaches an ordered sequence of steps at Fig. 27 through Fig. 31. Beall presents plurality of potential steps within each of the ordered sequence of steps as example of Fig. 30, wherein there are steps of “select the knowledge base” and “select the class”. After chosen the desired knowledge base and class, the user click “next” to proceed next one of the order sequence of steps (Fig. 31, Beall at el.). This process repeats until user clicks “Finish” to complete the service.

Regarding claim 17, Beall discloses said Data Wizard inhibits presentation of any step which would not be valid for the corresponding position within said ordered sequence (Col. 30, lines 6-7, wherein the presentation of any step is inhibited by using “cancel button” Beall at el.).

Regarding claim 18, Beall discloses said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the Internet (Internet 5124, Fig. 3, Beall at el.).

Regarding claim 19, Beall teaches a commercial data base management system (See col. 3, lines 31-59, Beall at el.).

Regarding claim 20, Beall discloses said user terminal further comprises an industry compatible personal computer (Client Computer 4018, Fig. 3, Beall at el.) having a commercially available browser (WWW Browser 4014, Fig. 3, Beall at el.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beall (US 6,169,992), in view of Black (US 6,285,998).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Beall discloses in a data processing system (Figs. 1-3) having a user terminal operated by a user (Client Computer 4018), the improvement comprising:

- a data base management system (Fig. 6) having a data base with executes an ordered sequence of command language script to modify data within said data base (Col. 43, lines 48-46, and col. 50, lines 9-16) coupled to said user terminal via a publicly accessible digital data communication network (Col. 3, line 20 to Col. 4, line 27);
- wherein said user terminal builds a service specifying one or more database management function for utilizing a data base management system to modify data from said database (Col. 43, lines 48-46, and col. 50, lines 9-16); and
- which responds to an ordered sequence of command language script (787, Fig. 43, col. 36, line 64 to col. 37, line 35)
- a Data Wizard (Figures 27-31) which permits said user to build said service as an ordered sequence of discrete and independent steps which correspond to

said ordered sequence of command language script (See col. 37, lines 14-21) and which presents a plurality of valid steps as choices for addition at each position in said plurality of discrete and independent steps (Col. 30, line 1 to Col. 31, line 11).

Beall is silent as to building service as a table and storing this service for future use. On the other hand, Black teaches generating reusable database queries and as a table (queries correspond to services) by using wizard and storing queries in the query storage area for future user (See col. 4, line 60 to col. 5, line 28, Black et al.). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to at the time of the invention was made to building service as a table and storing it for future use as taught by Black. One would have been motivated to modify Beall system as per above for the purpose of organizing steps into row and column so that enhancing dynamically building and utilizing customized services and for reusing the stored query so that user can perform database management function quickly.

Regarding claims 2, and 7, Beall/Black discloses said publicly accessible digital data communication network further comprises the Internet (Internet 5124, Fig. 3, Beall at el.).

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 13-14, Beall/Black discloses said user terminal further comprises an industry compatible personal computer (Client Computer 4018, Fig. 3, Beall at el.) having a commercially available browser (WWW Browser 4014, Fig. 3, Beall at el.).

Regarding claims 4, 8, and 12, Beall/Black discloses said Data Wizard inhibits presentation of any step which would not be valid for the corresponding position within said ordered sequence (Col. 30, lines 6-7, wherein the presentation of any step is inhibited by using “cancel button”, Beall at el.).

Regarding claims 5, 10, and 15, Beall/Black teaches a commercial data base management system (See col. 3, lines 31-59, Beall at el.).

Regarding claim 11, Beall/Black discloses a method of dynamically building a service (Figs. 27-31, Beall at el.) defined by a table which specifies at least one data based management function as addressed above in claim 1 from a user terminal (Client Computer 4018, Fig. 3, Beall at el.) coupled via a publicly accessible digital data network (Internet 5124, Fig. 3, Beall at el.) to a remote data base management system which responds to an ordered sequence of command language script (787, Fig. 43, col. 36, line 64 to col. 37, line 35, Beall at el.) having a component building process (Figs. 1-3, and Col. 3, line 20 to Col. 4, line 27, Beall at el.). Beall/Black teaches an ordered sequence of steps at Fig. 27 through Fig. 31. Beall/Black presents plurality of potential steps within each of the ordered sequence of steps as example of Fig. 30, wherein there are steps of “select the knowledge base” and “select the class”. After chosen the desired knowledge base and class, the user click “next” to proceed next one of the order sequence of steps (Fig. 31, Beall at el.). This process repeats until user clicks “Finish” to complete the service. Beall/Black further discloses storing said completed service for future use as address above in claim 1.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 06/24/2004 with respect to claims 1-20 have been fully considered but they are considered moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's remarks regarding the provisional double patenting rejection are noted. However, absent a terminal disclaiming or amendment patentability differentiating the inventions, the rejection stands.

Applicant argues that Beall/Black does not teach or suggest the new amended claims limitation of modification to the data within the database. The examiner respectfully points out that this limitation is recited at Column 43, lines 48-46, and column 50, lines 9-16 wherein a schema editor of the database management system is provided for modifying and changing the schema or database which is used for query management.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2161

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

MN

MN

November 13, 2004


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100